

CONCORDIA UNIVERSITY

Council of the Faculty of Arts and Science

Minutes of the meeting held on Friday, September 28, 1990

- Present: C.L. Bertrand; M. Yates; B. Harris; S. Ruby; F. Stevens; C.W. White; T. Swift; J. Appleby; J. Gavin; M. Brian; G. Kanaan; B. Lewis; D. Shapiro; W. Knitter; G.M. Auchinachie; C. Levy; R. Kilgour; D. Frost; G. Adams; H. Shulman; J. Locke; C. Davis; W. Byers; C. Gray; R. Sharma; M. Poirier; N. Segalowitz; M. Oppenheim; M. Taylor; S. Hoecker-Drysdale; G. Newsham; S. Lanthier-O'Connor; C. Ragaven; H. Danakas; J. Drolet; S. Farber; B. Farmer; E. Kalantar; B. Leonhardt; E. Budit; K. Clément.
- Guests: M. Kusy (Board of Graduate Studies); C. Solar (Advisor to the Rector on the Status of Women); B. Chester (The Thursday Report); W. Gilsdorf (Arts and Science Status of Women Committee).
- Regrets: P.J. Albert; P. Widden; E. Preston; G. Fisher; R. Perigoe; A. Planells; C. Potworowski.
- Absent: M. Szabo; Z. Hamlet; H. McQueen; H.S. deRomer; G. Trudel; Glen Bastien; Lison Cohen; G. Grougrou; J. Gruman; P. Richards.

Documents considered and distributed at this meeting:

- ASFC 90-5M-A Election/Ratification - Arts and Science Faculty Committees
- ASFC 90-5M-B Nominations for Honourary Degree Candidates
- ASFC 90-5M-C Curriculum Course Changes 1991-92 (Graduate - Report 69G), (Undergraduate - Addendum to Report 67U - ASFC May 11)
- ASFC 90-5M-D Addition of Faculty Member from Cognate Department to Undergraduate Evaluation Committee
- ASFC 90-5M-E Report and Resolution of Status of Women Committee
- ASFC 90-5M-F Request for increased membership to the Curriculum Committee - memo F. Stevens
- ASFC 90-5M-G Approval of Graduation Lists, Fall Convocation 1990

6
2015

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 14:35.

2. Approval of Agenda

There were no corrections or changes to be made to the Agenda and Dean Bertrand accepted the Agenda as approved.

3. Remarks from the Chair

As it was the first Arts and Science Faculty Council meeting of the academic year, and in the spirit of collegiality, everyone present introduced themselves and identified the area of the university with which they were affiliated.

Dean Bertrand remarked that the fact that we walked from Sir George Campus to Loyola Campus for the Shuffle did not mean the Shuttle Bus service will be cancelled. Although if it were, we would have the healthiest student body and faculty in Canada. He congratulated all those who made it with him.

4. Approval of Minutes of the Meeting held May 11, 1990 and May 22, 1990

90-5-1 It was moved and seconded (Levy/Byers) that the minutes of the meeting held May 11, 1990 be accepted.

Ms. Appleby noted that on page 5, No. 8, second paragraph should read, "photocopier" fees are separate from the library accounts.

90-5-2 It was moved and seconded (Davis/White) that the minutes of the meeting held May 22, 1990 be approved with the correction noted.

Carried

5. Approval of Fall Graduation Lists

The approval of the Graduation Lists was to take place in a closed session as these were confidential until presented at Senate. The Dean, therefore, requested that all visitors leave for this portion of the meeting.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

6. Election/Ratification - Arts and Science Faculty Committees

Dr. B. Gilsdorf, Professor in the Department of Communication Studies, agreed to serve as Election Scrutineer. Dr. Bertrand thanked Dr. Gilsdorf for

agreeing to do this.

Dr. Bertrand also announced to Council that Dr. Bill Gilsdorf had recently been awarded one of the ten prestigious 3M Teaching Awards honouring him as one of the outstanding university teachers in Canada. Dr. Gilsdorf was given a warm round of applause.

Arts and Science Faculty Council Steering Committee:

Dr. Susan Hoecker-Drysdale (Sociology and Anthropology)

Dr. William Byers (Mathematics and Statistics)

Professor Eileen Preston (Classics)

Professor Harvey Shulman (Liberal Arts College)

Elected by Secret Ballot

Arts and Science Faculty Curriculum Committee:

Dr. Guy LaChappelle (Political Science)

Elected by Acclamation

Arts and Science Faculty Appeal Committee:

Dr. Effie Gavaki (Sociology and Anthropology)

Elected by Secret Ballot

University Senate:

Professor Katherine Waters (English)

Elected by Acclamation

Board of Graduate Studies:

Dr. Michael Oppenheim (Religion) - 3 year term

Dr. J. Chaikelson (Psychology) - 6 month term

Elected by Acclamation

Graduate Awards Committee:

Dr. John Capobianco (Chemistry and Biochemistry)

Dr. Vered Talai (Sociology and Anthropology)

Elected by Acclamation

Evaluation Committee for the Dean of Graduate Studies:

Dr. Joyce Barakett (Education, Ph.D. Humanities)

Dr. Dolores Gold (Psychology)

Elected by Secret Ballot

Arts and Science Faculty Panel:

Mical Moser, CUSA representative
 Melodie Sullivan, CUSA representative
 Eva Jando, CUSA representative
 Kriss Clément, CUSA representative
Ratified by Council

Arts and Science Student Request Committee:

Helen Danakas
Ratified by Council

Arts and Science Honours Committee:

Tammy Powell
Ratified by Council

Dean Bertrand announced that the Notice of Elections was for the meeting of Friday, October 26, 1990. Nominations should be sent to Madeleine Yates by October 17, 1990.

7. **Nominations for Honourary Degree Candidates**

Dean Bertrand mentioned to Council that they had received a Nomination form for Honourary Degree Candidates. He encouraged members of the faculty and the students to nominate candidates by November 1, 1990 to the Graduation Ceremonies Committee.

8. **Curriculum Course Changes 1991-92**

90-5-4 It was moved and seconded (Stevens/Byers) that Council accept the Graduate Calendar changes as contained in Report 69G (ASFC-5M-C).

Dr. Stevens brought to Council's attention that in the Mathematics (MTM - Diploma in the Teaching of Mathematics) proposal, the words "Option A and Option C" be removed. The option previously titled A will now read, Diploma in the Teaching of Secondary School Mathematics and the option previously titled C will now read, Diploma in the Teaching of Primary School Mathematics.

Courses in the Master's (MTM- Diploma in the Teaching of Mathematics) proposal (600 numbers) were to be cross-listed with appropriate 500-level numbers.

Carried

- 90-5-5 It was moved and seconded (Stevens/Knitter) that Council accept the Addendum to Report 67U (ASFC May 11, 1990) Undergraduate Curriculum Course Changes.

Dr. Hoecker-Drysdale asked if it was usual for Calendar course descriptions to include suggested texts as in LBCL 391. Professor Shulman replied that all Liberal Arts College courses included texts in the course descriptions. The question was referred to Ms. Christine Brown, Assistant to the Vice-Dean Curriculum, who confirmed that it was not unusual for texts to be included in course descriptions in the Undergraduate Calendar.

Carried

- 90-5-6 It was moved and seconded (Stevens/Auchinachie) that Council accept the Editorial Changes for 1991-92 as part of Document 67U.

Proposed New Courses - BIOL 482, CHEM 412 - Reports 69G Graduate and 67U Undergraduate

Dr. Shapiro wanted to know what was meant by the phrase, "pending review of all Statistics Courses. They will be proposed as regular courses for 1992-93." This was to be found on the Errata sheet. His assumption was that someone was worried about the proliferation of Statistics courses. There was a proposal to offer two new Statistics courses. He asked for assurance that someone was looking into the question of the proliferation of statistics courses.

Dr. Stevens responded that both those new courses were approved by Faculty Council last year but when they were considered by APC a review of all Statistics courses was set in motion. There had not been time to complete that review and as a result, the courses would remain as slot courses for this year. Pending completion of that review, a decision would be made whether or not they would be inserted for 1992-93, with improved calendar descriptions.

Dr. Byers requested of Dr. Stevens and the Faculty Curriculum Committee that when statistics courses were proposed as part of Calendar changes from a department other than Mathematics and Statistics, that the Department of

Mathematics and Statistics be consulted so that mini-Mathematics departments did not spring up all over the faculty.

Dr. Stevens noted Dr. Byers' concerns and said that her office would keep this request in mind.

Carried

8a. Addition of Faculty Member from Cognate Department to Undergraduate Evaluation Committee

90-5-7 It was moved and seconded (Stevens/Locke) that Council approve the addition of a faculty member from a cognate department to be selected by the Department doing an undergraduate program evaluation.

Dr. Gray asked if the department doing the evaluation would identify from which department the faculty member will selected.

Dean Bertrand responded in the affirmative.

Dr. Oppenheim commented that he supposed this item came to Council last year when he was away, and that he expected that the entire process would be an internal matter especially if the department were evaluating its own program and would chose the "external". It seemed to him that it was rather a self evaluation being undertaken.

Dr. Stevens responded that if a department were evaluating its own programs, it might benefit from help from a colleague.

Dr. Bertrand reminded Council that reviews of two departments in the faculty had been started as a pilot study. It may well be that within five or six months the two departments involved may come back to Council suggesting that someone from outside the university (aside from the pedagogical consultant who was already part of the committee's structure) be appointed. Council did not wish to take that step last year and so in the pilot study the evaluation would be viewed as an internal exercise rather than an accreditation by outside experts along the lines of the Board of Graduate Studies' appraisals.

Dr. Oppenheim asked if a report would be presented at Council.

Dr. Bertrand replied that a report would come to Council for information.

Carried

9. Report and Resolution of Status of Women Committee (ASFC 90-5M-E)

90-5-8 It was moved and seconded (Oppenheim/Segalowitz) that Arts and Science Faculty Council approve the Resolution proposed by the Status of Women Committee.

Council approved speaking privileges for Dr. W. Gilsdorf, member of the Status of Women Committee and Dr. C. Solar, Advisor to the Rector, on the Status of Women.

Discussion:

Dr. Newsham suggested that Question 2 be amended to read "Do you think that the content of this course reflects the contribution to society of both men and women in a fair and equitable way?" If the question was left as it was, it suggested the question was directed to the field. She informed Council that she taught English grammar using a book written by two men - what were the students to say?

With respect to Question No. 2. Dr. Auchinachie queried, "contribution to what?"

Dr. Gilsdorf asked for speaking privileges because for the past couple of years he was Chair of the Arts and Science Faculty Council Status of Women Committee. He assured Council that the Committee anticipated that there would be a number of questions and so he prepared some introductory comments about the proposal that the two questions be made mandatory on all Arts and Science course evaluation forms for a limited time of five years. Some people already know that there have been a number of initiatives, many of them started at the Rector's Office level, looking at issues of equity, in terms of hiring and so forth. The ASFC Status of Women Committee explored how they could best serve the interests of the Arts and Science Faculty and began to examine some other areas of issue. As indicated in the report, the areas of curriculum and classroom climate were two areas targeted for research in order to get some kind of understanding of whether there was a problem there or not. To that end the committee discussed a number of alternatives, one of them listed in the report, was the pilot program started

in the Department of History. History volunteered to work closely with the committee to take a look at their curriculum to see if there were ways in which it might be evaluated in terms of gender balance and also to begin to look at notions of how women and men were treated in the classroom setting. He wished to make it very clear that other departments were invited to do the same.

The committee also thought it might take some initiative in reinstituting two questions that were created several years ago by the university-wide Status of Women Committee. These two questions were submitted to the Learning Development Office for departments to include on their course evaluation questionnaires on a voluntary basis. According to Dr. Ron Smith, Director of the Learning Development Office which administers course evaluation questionnaires and with whom Dr. Gilsdorf had consulted, the record of use of these questions on a voluntarily basis, was poor. The Committee felt that the time had come to make a real effort to begin research and provide data on whether or not there were problems, and if there were, to find out in which departments. It was also time to signal to professors that this was at least a question that they should be thinking about in terms of curriculum design. At the same time it was a way to signal to the students that this was a legitimate area for them to consider when completing course evaluations. The Collective Agreement was taken into account with respect to the rights of privacy of individual faculty members. Dr. Smith had no problem with the questions. He noted that because of the Collective Agreement the Committee would not have access to any written comments, and information could only be released on a summary basis but the Committee felt it was still a worthwhile undertaking since it was not trying to find out specifics about individual professors unless they chose to volunteer information.

Smith asked for flexibility in the scaling, because departmental questionnaires were different and scales varied from department to department. Some departments used a 5 point scale, some a 6 point scale and some a 7 point scale. Finally, he has asked to be allowed to phase in the two questions in order to minimize costs as he maintained a stock of questionnaires for a number of departments and he would like to phase in the questions when stocks were used up and new forms were being reprinted. By the end of this year all departments could be on line if this proposal were adopted by the Arts and Science Faculty Council. He acknowledged that course evaluations was a difficult and sensitive area.

Dr. Knitter accepted the sentiments behind this resolution but wished to have clarified the authority of Faculty Council to make these questions mandatory. He noted that if his memory of the Collective Agreement served him well,

this matter would come under departmental authority as each department had the right to set up its own teaching evaluation form. If that were the case, then this matter would be one for departments to decide.

Dr. Bertrand responded that he felt that Faculty Council had the authority to instruct departments to do certain things, within the framework of a system of evaluation that was already in place. He could not remember the Collective Agreement word for word either, but was pretty sure that there was nothing in there that gave the final word to any body in particular on the content of the actual questionnaires. The only thing he remembered about teaching evaluations was that faculty members should use them. At this point at least, he would certainly rule that Council had the authority to instruct departments that these questions must be added to whatever questionnaire they currently used.

Dr. Knitter stated that he believed the Dean was incorrect. His objection was not against the spirit of the proposal, but it seemed to him that it was beyond this body's authority to mandate the inclusion of the questions. Dr. Knitter believed that departments were mandated to set the evaluation and could therefore determine the nature of the evaluation. Council would be in an awkward position to mandate in an area where it had no authority.

Dr. Knitter wished to make two further points. Each department was mandated to have an official evaluation form. The second point was that instructors must provide some input on student evaluation. They did not have to use the official form, they could use whatever form they wished.

Dr. Bertrand said that the Collective Agreement does not say **must use**, it says **should or shall**.

Dr. Knitter said that nowhere in either of those two points does it say what this Council could mandate.

Dr. Bertrand could only remember part of Article 12 and 14 and in neither case could he recall the phrase giving departments the right to do this. He admitted that he could be wrong on this particular point.

Dr. Frost agreed with Dr. Knitter's recollection of the Collective Agreement. He pointed out that in the old Division II, a number of departments used not to have the questions equivalent to "how do you rate this course overall" and "how do you rate the instructor overall" and the word was passed pretty rapidly that if you wished your questionnaires to be looked at, at all seriously, those questions had better be in there and most people got the message. It

would be possible for this Council to send a message to all departments that if they wished their questionnaires to be looked at sympathetically in the future, these questions had better appear.

Dr. Adams discussed at length many possible interpretations of the questions and the intent of the Committee when they were formulated. There were conflicts here between academic freedom on the one hand and the right of students to identify prejudice and to indicate who was guilty of it on the other. He suggested possible rephrasing and finally suggested that the questions ought to be rethought by faculty, students and the university community.

Dr. Bertrand's decision on the matter raised by Dr. Knitter was that Council had the right to pass this motion. He stated that if there were a possible clash with the Collective Agreement after Council had made its decision, should Council vote against it there would be no need to worry about it, should Council vote for it the matter would have to be looked into. Should the Collective Agreement say something that prohibited Council from insisting on this, then Dr. Frost's suggestion would be useful - using the questions as an appropriate signal to all departments. Either way, he was prepared to continue the debate and to have a vote on the motion at some point during the afternoon.

Dr. Taylor raised a number of problems with the first question and suggested a number of possible interpretations. She expressed discomfort with not knowing whether prejudice against both men and women were being measured and the uncertainty about the respondent's sex. She expressed a desire to have the questions redesigned so as to clarify her concerns about the validity of any interpretation of the data. As for the second question, she pointed out that some courses were gender specific and were intended to be so. She wondered how such courses would be dealt with.

Dr. Sharma said that maybe his Indian background was responsible for his feeling that it was inappropriate for Council to pass this resolution. He thought that this was pushing the women's issue too far.

Dr. Gray made three points. He could not recall ever having seen these questions before nor did he have any knowledge that his department had the option of including them on a course evaluation questionnaire. If this were so, perhaps his department were not the only one which hadn't used the questions on a voluntary basis and perhaps it would be inappropriate to make their inclusion mandatory before departments had an opportunity to use them voluntarily. He wondered what the experience of other departments were on

this matter. The second point had to do with the introduction to the resolution, more specifically the use of "whereas, there was a need for historical data", and the third whereas - "for historical and research purposes". He wondered whether the Committee had the pilot project in History in mind when the phrasing was selected. He noted that the phrasing excluded doctrinal data or argumentative contributions pertaining to a particular discipline. The third point had to do with the questions themselves, particularly the first. He believed that it may very well be an unreliable question in so far as it could work against the intent of the designers. He illustrated a case where a gender equal teacher by overusing the female gender could elicit a response a class such as the following, "I don't like the way in which he brings in women all the time, it bothers me. I wouldn't study stuff like that." The answer to the first question would then be "yes" although the behaviour itself was what the question was trying to reinforce.

Dr. Solar tried to put the debate in a historical context within the university setting. She pointed out that around 30 years ago less than 20% of students at university were women whereas in 1990 the figure was up to 60% at the undergraduate level in Arts and Science. The university and the faculty were going through tremendous changes in a very short time. The reason why there were Status of Women Committees everywhere was to help the university to change because society had changed, and knowledge had changed. Discrimination within the university happened on different levels. What was being addressed was how education, training and knowledge were being transmitted.

The questions took four years to get to this stage. No question could answer all the questions that are raised about teaching. The purpose here was to look at the teaching environment. A number of elements interplay in a classroom. The course outline, the teacher-student relationship, the pedagogical ability of the teacher, the feedback and evaluation from the student, the material itself and the physical environment. Two issues are addressed by the two questions. Course outline and material - content are addressed by Question 2. All other aspects are addressed by Question 1.

From literature available on the issue of discrimination in teaching it has been shown that there is willful discrimination but most of it is not willful. The first would help us to identify whether as teachers we are perceived to act in a different way with respect to men or women. In general people do, so the question was expanded to include the phrase, "in a way that is detrimental to your learning". This would narrow it down to the teaching environment and to the students' capacity to learn in that situation.

We want to have an overall picture because the Status of Women's Office received many complaints from students, also sometimes from professors on this issue of differential treatment in the classroom. There was clearly a need to have a clear picture of what went on in a classroom. Should Council not support those two questions it would in effect be refusing to support the Status of Women's Committee in its efforts to move forward on the issue. Although the issue was sensitive one, it was important for Council to show support for the Arts and Science Faculty Council Status of Women's Committee in this endeavour.

Dr. Shapiro suggested that although everyone was sympathetic to the arguments that were being made and to the intent of the resolution, he was becoming increasingly uncomfortable with the questions as the discussion progressed. He felt that many people were going to be unhappy about having those questions on their course evaluations which after all were used for purposes other than simply data collection. More importantly, these questions seemed to be entirely ambiguous and it was not clear that the results could be interpreted in any meaningful way. So long as the scales were different from department to department the statistical interpretation of the results were likely to be entirely ambiguous. He personally would prefer to have a questionnaire with a constant scale, which was independent of course evaluations but administered by the Faculty of Arts and Science and distributed in each and every class for 5 years. He wanted to have an entirely scientific questionnaire based on scientific questions with scientific scaling so that everyone knew what the results meant. He announced that he would regretfully vote against this motion but would prefer to have something in fact quite a bit stronger.

Dr. Adams responding to Dr. Sharma's comments with respect to the second question suggested that if one were teaching a course in the pure science where women have not made any contribution until the 20th century, one could point this out in an introductory lecture and so protect oneself against the charge of sexism in teaching a course which was in fact male oriented and dominated until recently.

Dr. Oppenheim noted that 4 years previously, the Status of Women Committee sent every Chair questions very close to these two, asking that their departments use them. In fact, the Department of Religion and the Faculty of Fine Arts have been using these questions since then. He had spoken many times to the Dean of Fine Arts about issues concerning gender equity and Dean Parker never mentioned having any problem with the questions. As Chair of Religion, he received statistical evaluations of all the different courses in the department and he had found the questions helpful.

There was a difference in behaviour and this difference affects learning. He thought that it was important for faculty to recognize that they will be looked at in terms of behaviour and content. He agreed with Dr. Adams that one could not say that in every discipline there was the same contribution by men and women but it was up to the faculty as both scholars and pedagogues to explain and be aware of that situation. This question would force teachers to ask themselves what women had contributed to the discipline and whether the course reflected whatever contribution there had been. Teachers must also ask whether they had done the study at the primary level to see what that contribution was. The assertion that there had been little or no contribution by women was one that was usually made too readily and falsely. This point should be made to students. For his part, Dr. Oppenheim would prefer to have a questionnaire with more questions to give to undergraduate students. At the graduate level the same could be considered but as a first step, the present questions should be considered a minimum.

Dr. Auchinachie expressed surprise that Dr. Smith thought the questions were unambiguous. He suggested that due to the ambiguity of the terms, equity, equality and equiponderosity the word equitable should be substituted by the words, fair and impartial.

Professor Shulman said that he had less concern with question number 1 than he had with question number 2, in that it was legitimate to enquire whether any student felt discriminated against but he doubted the ability of students to evaluate content. He further suggested that all forms of discrimination, not sexism alone, should be cause for concern. He deplored the fact that the only question this university would mandate would be one on gender and content when there were a variety of issues to be taken into account when evaluating teaching.

Dr. Poirier proposed that question number one be divided into two parts; one specifying behaviour towards men, the other, behaviour towards women.

Professor Brian suggested that in view of the variety of the views expressed and the question of whether the resolution could be made mandatory that Arts and Science Faculty Council leave the matter to departmental decision and not implement it hierarchically.

Dr. Bertrand observed that Faculty Council was not hierarchical but made up of representatives elected by departments.

Dr. Gilsdorf acknowledged that the discussions had been helpful and that certain problems referred to would be taken into account when interpreting

the results of these questions. He stated that the Committee had wanted to limit the number of questions and to pose them in the most legitimate way in the course evaluation system. He also reminded Council that because of the difficulties anticipated, a 5 year time limit was suggested. He hoped that Council would support this measure to signal the importance of this endeavour.

Dr. Taylor expressed concern that the proposed questions would not give reliable information in their present format due to their ambiguity and suggested that they be used as a pilot test this year while the Status of Women Committee work on resolving the ambiguities. She suggested that by next year questions could be formulated with which everyone would be happy.

Dr. Hoecker-Drysdale drew Council's attention to the publication, *Despite the Odds*, a 500-page book on Canadian Women in Science. She pointed out that the invisibility of women was due to problems in both pedagogy and discipline content. She recommended that because of the methodological problems raised by various members of Council that each department formulate its own version of Question 2 regarding course content and that Question 1 regarding sexist behavior in the classroom remain as proposed.

Dr. Levy questioned the likelihood of these questions appearing on this year's course evaluations. If there was no chance of them getting on to the questionnaires this year, he suggested that as the question was an important one, it would be better to keep them under discussion.

Dr. Bertrand said that if he understood Dr. Gilsdorf correctly, Dr. Smith had informed him that by the spring evaluations, most departments would have new evaluation forms and with the questions.

Dr. Gilsdorf agreed. He urged Dr. Levy to use the questions in the French Department on the student evaluation questionnaires, even if this was not mandated by Faculty Council.

Dr. Knitter pointed out that Marjorie McKinnon had pointed out that the Learning Development Office would need monetary support if questionnaires were to be revised for each and every department in Arts and Science to include the two questions.

Dr. Bertrand stated that he would be more than happy to help them out with any budgetary problems that they might have as a result of this issue.

Dr. Byers recommended that the idea of Dr. Drysdale's suggestion. He felt that he could support such a resolution and suggested that we do something at this meeting or failing that, at the next meeting.

Dr. Segalowitz had exactly the same sentiments. He noted that he seconded the original motion but as the discussion developed he would like to move that Question 1 be divided into two questions as suggested earlier to read as follows:

90-5M-9 **An amendment to Motion 90-5M-8 was moved and seconded (Segalowitz/Adams) that Council replace Question 1 with:
Be it resolved that the Arts and Science Faculty Council . . . 1) Is the instructor's behaviour toward men in this course detrimental to your learning? and 2) Is the instructor's behaviour toward women in this course detrimental to your learning?**

Dr. Poirier objected to the words, "behaviour toward" He pointed out that we did not know if it were positive or negative in essence and that that was the problem. Was the instructor prejudiced against men in this course? Was the instructor prejudiced against women in this course? He pointed out that the prejudice may very well be in favour of women.

Dr. Oppenheim did not have a fundamental problem with the splitting of the first question but noted that he did have a problem with a suggestion to drop the second question.

Dr. Bertrand reminded Dr. Oppenheim and Council that the discussion was the amendment to the motion and thus only Question 1 was being deal with at that time.

Dr. Oppenheim again pointed to his department's experience in using the questions for four years. He spoke against splitting the question into two. He suggested that if there were problems with behaviour to either gender, it should be flagged.

Dr. Shapiro felt that Dr. Oppenheim's argument was exactly why the question should be split or the questionnaires would all have to clarified because as he understood it the purpose collecting these data was to provide historical data or some kind of understanding as to what went on in the classroom. The purpose of collecting data was statistical. No one had the luxury of looking at each case individually. Overall numbers would be looked at and interpreted. Unfortunately, if the question was ambiguous then the numbers would have

no meaning. On an individual case, the questions might be useful where you had the luxury of following them up.

Dr. Bertrand pointed out that since the questions would appear on the teaching evaluation questionnaires for each department in the faculty of Arts and Science and the individual professor and the Chair of the department would receive the answers to these questions along with all the other answers to the questionnaire therefore, the Chairs would have the luxury that Dr. Shapiro was talking about. The Chairs would be able to identify individual problems, they would be able to discuss with individual faculty members the responses;-at the same time, the Committee of the Status of Women at the Faculty level would be provided with the aggregate statistical information. So, it will be used for both purposes.

Dr. Gilsdorf apologized but informed Council that he had to leave because of a prior engagement.

Dr. White spoke against the amendment.

Dr. Adams recollected that from past enquiries to CAUT on the question of course evaluations he had learned that at one end of the scale there was extreme signalling of abuse. However students in general were generous toward faculty. He argued that students be given the choice of signalling behaviour that they judged to be outrageous.

Mr. Farmer felt that these questions were not very valuable for gathering statistical information. He felt that their main usefulness would be as signal to students and to professors that this university was concerned about gender issues.

Dr. Solar made the point that the collection of the data was not only for statistical purposes. The aim of the questions was also to sensitize students and faculty members to move on this issue on a personal basis, within the classroom. She preferred the question not to be split in two because the purpose of the question was to look at the teaching interaction (teacher-student) within the classroom in the context of what is learned as a student and by the male/female comparison. She also made the point that students were knowledgeable enough, intuitive enough and strong enough to be able to answer these questions. She also stated that it could be argued that most questions on student evaluation questionnaires were ambiguous.

Dr. Bertrand called for the vote on the amendment.

Dr. Gray asked if the mover of the amendment who was the seconder for the original motion, meant that Dr. Segalowitz had withdrawn his support for the original motion should the amendment fail?

Dr. Bertrand said that he wished to have the vote.

Dr. Shulman asked if this amendment included the Whereas's or did it begin at "Be it resolved . . .".

Dr. Bertrand responded that it begun with "Be it resolved that. . .".

90-5M-9 An amendment to Motion 90-5M-8 was moved and seconded (Segalowitz/Adams) that Council replace Question 1 with:
Be it resolved that the Arts and Science Faculty Council . . . 1) Is the instructor's behaviour toward men in this course detrimental to your learning? and 2) Is the instructor's behaviour toward women in this course detrimental to your learning?

Vote: 16 against
14 for
4 abstentions

90-5-8 It was moved and seconded (Oppenheim/Segalowitz) that Arts and Science Faculty Council approved the Resolution proposed by the Status of Women Committee.

Dr. Byers wished to propose a motion to vote on Questions 1 and 2 separately.

Dr. Bertrand asked Dr. Oppenheim as the mover of the motion if Dr. Oppenheim had difficulty with splitting the motion into two. Dr. Bertrand said that he, himself, did.

Dr. Oppenheim said that he did not want the motion to be split.

Dr. Bertrand said that he had some difficulty with that motion procedurally. He instructed Council to vote on the motion as it was proposed.

Dr. Byers responded that these were two separate questions which stood independently of one another and he believed it would be in order to split the

motion.

Dr. Bertrand was not so certain that the questions were separate. Dr. Bertrand said that the resolution before Council contained two points and he felt that Council should vote on that resolution.

Dr. Hoecker-Drysdale offered to rephrase her earlier suggestion to make it an amendment. She stated that if Council had difficulty in dealing with the two questions together she would prefer to make a broader choice between accepting the resolution as it stood or a second choice of accepting in principle the two questions, question one on behaviour and a second question on content. She felt that departments could be given the option of formulating their own question on content if they felt that they could not use the one under discussion but that they be required to formulate a question.

Dr. Bertrand had procedural problems with her suggestion and pointed out that it completely changed the thrust of the main motion. The main motion does say mandatory. Dr. Bertrand felt that by amending the motion to make two questions which were open to change by departments, violated in a parliamentary sense, the original motion.

Dr. Bertrand called for the vote:

Vote: 20 for
10 against
6 abstentions

Carried

10. Request for Increase In Membership to the Curriculum Committee

90-6M-10

It was moved and seconded (Stevens/Leonhardt) that Faculty Council approve the addition of two new faculty members to the Curriculum Committee to be added to its present complement of five, and that student representation be increased from three to four by adding another graduate student.

Dr. Stevens argued that the heavy workload of the Faculty Curriculum Committee would be eased if the membership were increased and asked Council to agree to the addition of two members.

Carried.

11. **Other Business**

There was no other business.

12. **Date and Time of Next Meeting**

The next meeting of Arts and Science Faculty Council will be October 26th at 2:00 p.m.

13. **Adjournment**

90-6M-11 It was moved and seconded (Frost/Farmer) to adjourn the meeting at 4:38 p.m.